













Case for the DE

We are much further down the road

- **Single entry for contractor (Web enabled)**
- **More user-friendly GUI interface**
- **Role based security (GCSS-AF) in place**
- **Recognizes contractor ICP now**
- **Can segregate by weapon system now**
- **Narrower data set = better response time**
- **Can tailor weapon system reports at desktop**
- **Permits easy access to historical/archived data**
- **Permits automated initial uploads**

Issues

- **Policy**
 - **Lack of System Interface Policy**
 - **Legacy System Access Policy**
- **DE**
 - **No Contractor data permitted thru DE**
 - **Delays in modification to legacy systems**
 - **Changing requirements**
 - **Lack of data for operational testing**
- **Funding**

Issue: Lack of recent HQ guidance on AF visibility of Contractor data

- Initial Guidance:
 - **Jun 97 - AF /IL Ltr (“Log Policy for C-17 Flexible Sust.”)**
 - **“Contractor will use standard AF systems where feasible”**
 - **“When using non-AF system, the contractor will assure AF visibility and access”**
 - **Sep 97 - AF/IL Ltr (“Log Policy for Future Systems”)**
 - **“AF visibility and access to data is essential”**
 - **“Standard AF systems must be fully utilized”**
 - **“Where non-AF system required, GCSS-AF stand/arch will be used”**
 - **Apr 99 - SAF/AQ LB 99-7 (“Product Support Partnerships”)**
 - **“always be a requirement to interface contractor sys w. DOD systems”**
 - **“contractor flexibility to use best practices (in terms of data systems), yet still provide a uniform integrated presentation to user”**

Lack of guidance (Continued)

- Recent Guidance: None that we are aware of
- Problem:
 - **Weap Sys SPOs and contractors do not now feel obligated to share data across systems**
 - **SPOs satisfied with what contractor tells him**
 - **Pilot sys OPRs object to contractor providing data in standard format (no contractual requirement, increased costs)**
 - **Legacy sys OPRs reluctant to accept batch input from contractor, and to provide contractor access to data**
 - **Requires mods to their system, firewalls, etc.**
- Suggested Action:
 - **AF/IL and SAF/AQ revisit policy and reissue guidance**
 - **Hold SPOs and legacy system OPRs accountable**

Issue: Lack of recent HQ AFMC Support

- Perception: **“HQ USAF initiative”**
- Problem:
 - **AFMC/LG:**
 - **Inconsistent policy**
 - **Reluctance to participate and commit resources**
 - **Delays in legacy system mods to accept contractor data**
 - **AFMC/DR:**
 - **Direction to/liaison with SPOs re. RSSP is nominal**
 - **Need DR staff support to counter LG staff resistance**
 - **Suggested Action:**
 - **Re-energize HQ AFMC support**

Issue: Delay in Data Exchange FOC

- Slip - **approximately 18 months due largely to:**
 - **Indecision by legacy system OPRs concerning contractor data**
 - **No contractor data, will permit through DE, will permit direct feed**
 - **Will only permit item by item manual entry, read only access, etc.**
 - **Delays in modifying legacy systems to accept contractor data**
 - **Contractor ICP codes, batch FTP inputs, disagreements over edits, etc.**
 - **Dynamic (changing) requirements**
 - **Program needs differ**
 - **Changing role of contractor/AF relationship during sustainment period**
 - **Not clearly definitized requirements**
 - **Not prioritized and fully understood by all parties**
 - **Lack of operational data for production testing**
 - **Most pilot programs too new to have operational data**
 - **Difficulty in mapping contractor data to ICD**